



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/802,205

03/17/2004

Michael Leu

4999-0030

3767

35301 7590 01/28/2008
MCCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CITY PLACE II
185 ASYLUM STREET
HARTFORD, CT 06103

EXAMINER

ABOAGYE, MICHAEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/802,205

Applicant(s)

LEU ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Aboagye

Art Unit

1793

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
- a) ☐ The period for reply expire _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) ~~as set~~ in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL -324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-24.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.


AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument remains unpersuasive for the reasons set forth in paragraph 9 of the final action mailed on September 25, 2007. In the amendment after final action, the applicant admitted that the wire bonder of Miyazaki has a bond head, however, the applicant argues that Miyazaki is silent as to the nature of operations of the bondhead. That figures 6 and 7 of Miyazaki do not disclose the electrical circuitry for controlling the motion of the bondhead. The examiner is not particularly sure as to what the applicant refers to as the electrical circuitry for controlling the motion of the bondhead, because said limitations are not set forth in the applicant's claimed invention. Miyazaki figures 1, 2, 6 and 7 depict electrical circuitry connected to the bondhead which has some features similar to that of applicant's figure 1. Miyazaki, in particular figure 7 shows a circuitry including a power module, contrary to what is asserted in applicant's remarks. As indicated in the final rejection Miyazaki teaches an emergency switch, (see, the final rejection paragraph 2. Applicant goes on to argue that there is no prior art that discloses the feature that the at least one emergency switch be configured for producing upon activation a signal for causing the control program to complete the current bond cycle and then suspend the further wiring. Nakamura does not expressly teach wire bonding apparatus, but teaches semiconductor manufacturing apparatus with an emergency switch operable at least one emergency switch be configured for producing upon activation a signal for causing the control program to complete the current bond cycle and then suspend the further operations. It is noted that Nakamura employs said emergency switch for the purposes of controlling and improving the manufacturing process of the semiconductor device. One of ordinary skill in the art would apply said known technique to improve similar devices in the same way. It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use said emergency switch in the apparatus of Miyazaki as taught by Nakamura for controlling and improving the wire bonding process. Nakamura, therefore remedies the deficiencies of Miyazaki. Applicant further asserts that, the claimed bondhead may be accelerated and decelerated one or more times before its motion is finished, and that neither Miyazaki nor Nakamura teach said operation. Applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that said limitations are not recited in the claims. The final rejections would therefore remain



JONATHAN JOHNSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER